

REMARKS

The final Office Action was issued on pending claims 1, 10-14 and 22-27. Claims 1, 10-14 and 22-27 stand rejected. In this Response, claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 22, 23, 26 and 27 have been amended and no claims have been added or cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 10-14 and 22-27 are pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous personal interview with Applicant's Representative. Applicant invites the Examiner to call Applicant's Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

Claim Amendments

Applicant's Representative and the Examiner discussed clarifying the claims during the personal interview. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 22, 23, 26 and 27 have been amended to clarify the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the clarifying amendments do not narrow the claims or surrender any subject matter.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. §103

In Office Action paragraph 2, claims 1, 14 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastering Windows 3.1 Special Edition by Robert Cowart (Cowart), Kawabata et al. (US 6,121,951) and Jenson et al. (US 6,236,396). In Office Action paragraph 3, claims 10-13 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart, Kawabata et al., Jenson et al. and Microsoft Outlook 97 by Russell Borland (Borland). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Referring to the clarified claims above, claim 1 pertains to an information processing apparatus. The information processing apparatus as a storage means which can store data in a plurality of different states when the data is created or changed, e.g., different versions of the data. The stored data includes time information for each different state (version) corresponding to a day and/or time at which the data is stored. Information processing apparatus also has an application program for use with the data. The application program can transmit the time information (day and/or time) to another application program and also receive time information corresponding to a day and/or time from the other application program. In other words, the

application program can exchange time information (day and/or time) with another application program. The information processing apparatus also has day and time setting means which sets a day and/or time in the application program based on the time information received from the other application program. A control means locates data from the stored plurality of different sets of data at about the set day and/or time, which was received from the other application program.

By way of example, the information processing apparatus stores a plurality of versions of data in which the days and/or times corresponding to each version are also stored. The application program can exchange day and/or time information with another application program. Also, the day and/or time can be set in the application program based on the day and/or time received from the other application program. The set day and/or time is then used to retrieve the stored data which corresponds to the version of the data at that set day and/or time.

Applicant respectfully submits that Cowart, Kawabata et al., Jenson et al. and Borland, alone or in combination, if such combination is proper, do not render the claims obvious. Applicant submits that those references do not disclose or suggest storing a plurality of different states of data, including day and/or time information for each different state. Further, those references do not disclose or suggest an application program which exchanges time information with another application program. Even further, those references do not disclose or suggest setting a day and/or time in the application program based on the time information received from the other application program and retrieving stored data from the plurality of different states of stored data which corresponds to the set day and/or time.

As properly recognized by the Office Action, the combination of Cowart and Kawabata et al. fails to teach the features of the claimed application program. The Office Action asserts, however, that Jenson et al. provides this missing feature. As discussed in the Amendment filed May 27, 2003, the Jenson et al. reference discloses a method or program for controlling a scheduler such that both the calendar and the schedule information of a selected date or range of dates are displayed within a single display window. Fig. 3a of Jenson et al. illustrates the scheduler 47 which appears on a screen 42 of a computer system 10, and includes a calendar C in a calendar area A_c and a schedule S in the schedule area A_s having a meeting box M containing information such as the topic of a meeting, for example (see col. 5, lines 19-27). The calendar C serves as the schedule S controller (see col. 5, lines 28-29). In operation, a single date or a range of dates are selected by placing a stylus over the area of the calendar that includes the desired

date, which results in the schedule S of the selected date or dates appearing in the schedule area A_s.

Thus, Jenson et al. describes a scheduling program for displaying both the calendar and the schedule of selected dates on a single window. However, claim 1 recites that the application program transmits and receives time information (day and/or time) to and from another application program. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in Jenson et al., alone or in combination with the other cited references.

Figures 5a-5d disclose examples of how the schedule program of Jenson et al. performs the application of displaying both the calendar and the schedule information of the selected dates on the same screen display. There is no transmitting or receiving of time information by the application program between the calendar and the schedule information, even if the calendar and the schedule information were treated as two separate applications.

Moreover, transmitting and receiving of the time information is carried out between different application programs in the present invention. As such, even if there were some form of exchange of time information between the calendar and the schedule information in the schedule area, it would only be within the same application program, i.e., the scheduling program. Jenson et al. does not disclose or suggest that the scheduling program transmits or receives the time information to another application program, such as an address and telephone book, for example, in a computerized personal organizer to which Jenson et al. is directed.

The Office Action states that "items within the calendar can represent a potential application program scheduled for execution at chosen time and day." As shown in Fig. 3a, the schedule 47 that appears on the screen 42 of the computer system 10 includes a schedule area A_s including the schedule S having the meeting box M containing information regarding the meeting at a prescribed time (see col. 5, lines 19-28). Assuming that "items within the calendar" refers to the corresponding schedule S, the meeting box M merely contains textual information about the meeting. The reference does not disclose or suggest that such schedule "represent a potential application program scheduled for execution at chosen time and day." For these reasons, the claims are allowable over Cowart, Kawabata et al. and Jenson et al.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY


Michael S. Leonard

Reg. No. 37,557
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4270

Dated: January 13, 2004